

REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 26, 32, 33, 39 and 47 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The combinations cited in support of the rejections include Dewberry (for generating a composite signal), Shibuya (for amplifying the signal) and Rutledge (for encrypting the signal). However, the essence of the rejection is that Gfeller teaches an optical transmitter which transmits multiple copies of a signal in different directions, thereby satisfying the limitation argued to be patentably distinguishing in the previous response. Applicant respectfully traverses. The Gfeller transmitter is basically an omnidirectional transmitter, and therefore transmits a single signal in substantially every direction rather than multiple copies in different directions. In the passage of Gfeller cited by the Office it is stated that the housing (12) includes diffuser means to provide for an apparent source enlargement,¹ and that the result of a full diffuser is a Lambertian source.² A Lambertian source is an optical source that obeys Lambert's cosine law. Such an optical source exhibits a large beam divergence, and a radiation pattern that approximates a sphere. The Figures of Gfeller cited by the Office illustrate this feature with transmission direction arrows in basically all directions. In contrast, the presently claimed invention uses multiple directional transmitters with non-identical transmission areas. As described in the specification,³ **each copy** of the composite signal **is transmitted by one** of the transponders (28) **in a different direction** than that utilized by the other transponders. Note that each transponder in Figure 2 is associated with a different transmission direction arrow, and none

¹ Col. 4, lines 54-56

² Col. 5, lines 6-7

of the arrows is in the same direction.⁴ This distinguishing feature is recited in claim 1, as amended, as “transmitting a plurality of copies of the outgoing signal, at least two copies of the outgoing signal being transmitted in different directions, a first copy being transmitted by a first directional transmitter and a second copy being transmitted by a second directional transmitter, the first and second transmitters having non-identical transmission directions.” The other independent claims recite similar distinguishing limitations. The dependent claims further distinguish the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-50 is therefore requested.

Claims 26 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for lack of antecedent basis for “the primary optical signal.” Appropriate correction has been made, as can be seen in the claims above.

³ Page 12, lines 19-21

⁴ There may be some overlap, as stated at page 12, lines 21-22

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 26, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-168
Dd: 6/24/2006